

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, and 23 which are independent, are hereby amended. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the specification. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

Claims 1 and 11 are amended herein, rendering the objection to the previous amendment moot.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 6, 11-13, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein, et al (hereinafter, merely "Schein").

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3, 8-10, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0014753 to Beach et al.

Claims 4 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,637 to Kanungo et al.

Claims 5 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,404,507 to Bohm et al.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0014753 to Beach et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,039 to Livowsky et al.

Claims 15 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,039 to Livowsky et al.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,428 to Lee et al.

Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al.

IV. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“...accessing a dictionary database based on an input retrieval keyword;

extracting a plurality of additional keywords from a dictionary database as a function of the input retrieval keyword,

wherein, in response to the input retrieval keyword, a plurality of additional keywords are extracted comprising keywords corresponding to a person's name and keywords corresponding to a possible misused used character in the input retrieval keyword...” (Emphasis Added)

As understood by Applicants, Schein relates to a method and apparatus for searching a guide and using a user's input of desired program characteristics to identify particular programs that may be of interest to the user. A user answers questions that aid identifying desired characteristics of a favorite program and then uses those responses to find other programs that may be of interest. Additionally, when a user is watching a program, the apparatus stores additional programs that may be of interest to the user based upon the program being watched.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Schein that discloses or suggests the above-identified features of independent claim 1. Specifically, Schein does not teach or suggest accessing a dictionary database based on an input retrieval keyword, extracting a plurality of additional keywords from a dictionary database as a function of the input retrieval keyword, wherein, in response to the input retrieval keyword, a plurality of additional keywords are extracted comprising keywords corresponding to a person's name and keywords corresponding to a possible misused used character in the input retrieval keyword, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above, amended independent claims 11 and 23 are patentable.

As understood by Applicants, the other art made of record does not add any disclosure that would render claim 1, 11, or 23 unpatentable.

V. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate the portion, or portions, of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any
overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800